

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The following discussion addresses the issues in the order in which they have been raised in the Office Action.

Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-13, 15, 17-24, 26, 28-35, 37, and 39-43 stand rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,526,063 issued to St-Amand, et al. ("St-Amand"). Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites a method in which *PTSE information is issued from a network node, the PTSE information having SIG information that describes bandwidth which has been allocated to specific priority levels of a bandwidth resource within an ATM PNNI network.* St-Amand does not teach or suggest such a method.

In St-Amand, a system for ATM-frame relay (FR) interworking of circuit signaling is described. According to the Office Action, St-Amand teaches a network node issuing PTSE information as claimed by Applicants, in Fig. 11 and at col. 6, line 55 to col. 7, line 5. A closer review of those portions of St-Amand, however, reveals that Fig. 11 only refers to the basics of a simplified frame relay (FR) call setup which assumes a strictly frame relay network (rather than an ATM network). St-Amand, col. 6, lines 58-61 ("As a background for this embodiment, the basics of a simplified frame relay call setup will be described by way of example with reference to Fig. 11 which assumes a strictly frame relay network."). Applicants' claimed PTSE information is specific to an ATM network. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the strictly frame relay network in Fig. 11 of St-Amand does not teach or suggest Applicants' claimed PTSE information.

In rejecting claim 1, the Office Action also refers to col. 9, line 60 through col. 10, line 29 of St-Amand as teaching priority levels of a bandwidth resource within an ATM

PNNI network. Although it is true that St-Amand refers to an ATM network and, in particular, ATM call setup messages, St-Amand does not teach or suggest that the ATM setup message contain Applicants' claimed SIG information that *describes bandwidth which has been allocated to specific priority levels of a bandwidth resource within the network*.

In St-Amand, the setup message may include a transfer priority (e.g., 0-15) and a bandwidth parameter (e.g., CIR, EIR, BC, etc.). Those parameters (which are frame relay specific parameters) are mapped to ATM specific parameters, such as ATM service category, maximum burst size (MBS), sustained cell rate (SCR), and peak cell rate (PCR). However, this information does not teach or suggest *information that describes bandwidth which has been allocated to specific priority levels of a bandwidth resource*. As an example of such information, see Applicants' Specification as filed, paragraph [0028], which describes an approach in which the nodes within an ATM network broadcast to one another the bandwidth they have allocated (e.g., in the form of active connections) to each priority level. This allows a source endpoint to develop a full perspective as to the manner in which bandwidth is being allocated, per priority level, and decide in light of this perspective whether or not the network as a whole can support a newly requested connection. St-Amand, however, only discloses the call setup message which refers to a **requested** ATM service category, as well as the **desired** bandwidth, e.g. SCR (cells per second), PCR (cells per second), and MBS (cells). There is no teaching or suggestion in St-Amand of a network node issuing PTSE information that describes how such bandwidth, for a bandwidth resource, has been allocated to specific priority levels.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

As to claim 12, this claim recites a method where an understanding of an ATM PNNI network is updated after reception of PTSE information which includes SIG information that describes bandwidth allocated to specific priority levels of a bandwidth resource in the network. As St-Amand does not teach or suggest how an

ATM node updates its understanding of an ATM PNNI network after reception of the claimed PTSE information, Applicants respectfully submit that St-Amand does not anticipate claim 12.

In claim 23, a machine readable-medium is recited in which sequences of stored instructions cause a digital processing system to prepare PTSE information that includes SIG information describing bandwidth which has been allocated to specific priority levels of a bandwidth resource within an ATM PNNI network. As St-Amand does not teach or suggest the preparation of such PTSE information, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 23.

Claim 34 is submitted as not being anticipated for at least the reasons given above in support claim 12.

Any dependent claims not mentioned above are submitted as not being anticipated or obvious, for at least the same reasons given above in support of their base claims.

It should be noted that not all of the assertions made in the Office Action, particularly those with respect to the dependent claims, have been addressed here, in the interest of conciseness. Applicants reserve the right to challenge any of the assertions made in the Office Action by the Examiner, with respect to the relied upon art references and how they would relate to Applicants' claim language.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No.

02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP


Dated: September 18, 2006

By 
Farzad E. Amini, Reg. No. 42,261

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted online via EFS Web to the Patent and Trademark Office, Commissioner for Patents, Post Office Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on September 18, 2006.


Margaux Rodriguez September 18, 2006